



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

(2) Although this is not indicated on the title-page, Roland and Beowulf are, like Siegfried, taken from Schalk's *Deutsche Heldensagen*. As remarked above, the Beowulf has by far received the more sympathetic treatment. Roland is a curious *Mischmasch* of archaic language and modern sentimentalism.

The *Anmerkungen* give a few general remarks, couched here and there in impossible German (p. 74: auch Karl musz die Niederlage rächen=auch musz Karl die Niederlage rächen; p. 76: Einwohner des Küstenlandes). There are similar, even if not numerous, slips in the *Fragen* (p. 49: Mit welcher Absicht wollte Ganelon seinen Herrn bewegen?) and *Aufgaben* (p. 65: einen Mord tun). In both (1) and (2) the pronoun of address used toward the pupil is *du*, whereas in (3) it is the plural *ihr*, but capitalized, one is at a loss to know on just what grounds.

(3) The *Übungen* are skillfully devised and of great variety. That stilted or archaic constructions (die seiner wartete, p. 46) should occur in the *Fragen* may be ascribed to the nature of the text itself. A curious phenomenon, met again and again in direct-method texts, is in striking evidence. Words of the text proper are assumed to be unknown even where they are of the most common and every-day kind, while words and expressions occurring in the Apparatus are *ipso facto* regarded as being known. Thus, to take only a single page of the *Fragen* (p. 48), *sich benehmen*, *Zweikampf*, *währen* are foreign to the Vocabulary, which, on the other hand, carefully registers *Vater*, *Mutter*, *all*, *jung*, *lieben*. The observation does not, to be sure, apply with any greater force to No. 3 than to Nos. 1 and 2.

B. J. Vos

*Indiana University*

*EXERCICES FRANÇAIS, ORAUX ET ÉCRITS, AVEC PRÉCIS DE GRAMMAIRE, Première Partie*, pp. IX + 218, *Deuxième Partie*, IX + 257, par M. S. PARGMENT, de l'Université de Michigan. The Macmillan Company. 1920.

These two volumes are published with a view to furnishing abundant material for practice in the study of French. They embody a method which, while composed of elements not new or original, taken as a whole presents an ingenious and distinct contribution to the methodology of modern language teaching. The author describes the method as that of "concentric circles." He means, one judges, that while each lesson presents a rounded whole in that it teaches vocabulary, grammar and composition, it constitutes, as compared with its predecessors, a widening in the knowledge of the subject matter.

Vocabulary is taught through the question and answer method. Each exercise of this type has, at the end, a brief vocabulary fur-

nishing the important words from which the answers are to be constructed. Vocabulary is also taught through "Idées Contraires" exercises. Grammar, theoretical grammar, is least emphasized. Its study is to be inductive and practical, and not by means of the *a priori* statements that constitute the accepted way in most high schools and colleges. Very interesting exercises made up of sentences to be completed, or sentences in which the proper tense and mood of a given infinitive are to be supplied, or in which the adjective is given in the masculine and the correct form is to be substituted, constitute the means for practical study of grammar. Finally, an element not least significant and yet sadly neglected in most elementary text books of French: practice in original composition, leading to the capacity for self expression in the language. This form of exercise is stressed. Every fourth lesson offers plans for original composition based on some selected topic.

While, viewed as a whole, the method offered by Mr. Pargment is novel and ingenious, aiming to bring about the results that the reformers of modern language teaching of today are seeking, questions may be raised on the following points. In the first place, is not the work in unfinished sentence exercises of a kind that would cause the interest and effort of the student to slacken? He has to re-think, indeed, the entire sentence in order to supply the missing part, yet the sentence, as a whole, appears taken out of the sphere of his constructive effort and will not mold his consciousness as would a sentence which he has constructed himself, entire.<sup>1</sup> In the second place, the question again may be raised as to the possibility of conveniently carrying on the original composition work in the classroom. The reviewer has used for one semester both of Mr. Pargment's books in two different courses and has found that part exceedingly awkward to handle. The reason is that only four or five members of the class can be called on to write their work on the blackboard. Every student, on the other hand, has his composition worked out in his own way. He is concerned to know how well he has done his own exercise, cannot understand and therefore cannot interest himself in the exercises on the blackboard. What is lacking here is apparently that uni-

<sup>1</sup>One realizes, of course, that the above criticism is directed against a type of exercise that is not of Mr. Pargment's invention, and that is, moreover, fast winning favor among modern language teachers. It is only the author's apparent fondness for the type that has caused the reviewer to state his objection to it in this connection. The reviewer is also aware that in the normative, as well as in the exact sciences, experiment alone can finally determine the merit of a theory. Yet he believes that an *a priori* consideration of its character and possibilities may be of value in deciding whether or not a theory ought to be tried out. His objection, which he desires to be viewed as a question rather than as an adverse judgment, is based partly on his experience with the type of exercise in question, and partly on a logical analysis of its character and possibilities.

form, common ground for work which alone makes for unified interest in the classroom.<sup>2</sup>

The second part of each one of the volumes contains a *Précis de Grammaire*. It is identical in both volumes and one wonders whether, in view of the fact that the second volume is to be used with more advanced students, the grammar offered in that volume should not also be of a more advanced type.

This *Précis de Grammaire* contains some inaccuracies, omissions, failures to emphasize the important and the introduction of the unimportant which cannot be passed over. Here are only a few typical instances of these defects.

Volume I, page 126, in remark 2 under IV. "L'insouciance est le défaut des jeunes gens," *des* is taken for the partitive and treated as an exceptional case. *Ibid.* "Satisfait des pauvre gens" is again considered as an instance of the partitive.

V. I, p. 137. "On remplace l'adjectif possessif mon, ton, son, par l'article" . . . . . quel article?

V. 1, p. 142, Less common adjectives, such as *âpre*, *assidu*, *clément*, *funeste*, *propre*, are discussed in regard to the preposition used with them, while more common ones, such as *bon*, *fort*, *gentil*, *prêt*, are omitted. Mr. Pargment fails also to indicate what part of speech these adjectives with the prepositions ascribed to them govern; and also fails to give the different prepositions with which these adjectives would govern different parts of speech.

V. 1, p. 146. In "Exception" under 2, *moi* and *toi* are replaced by *me* and *te* before *en*. Nothing is said of *moi* and *toi* before *y*, and yet the exception here is perhaps as important as it is in the case in which it is indicated.

V. 1, p. 146 to 147. On these two pages the various personal pronouns are taken up but no provision is made for the reflexive; in fact, in no place in the "Exercises" is it discussed.

V. 1, p. 152. "*Que*, pronom interrogatif, ne se dit que des choses et ne peut être que complément direct ou sujet d'un verbe impersonnel." As an instance of *que* used as subject of an impersonal verb Mr. Pargment gives the sentence *qu' est-il arrivé*. *Que* could hardly be said to be a subject of *est arrivé*. The verb has already for subject *il* and the introduction of another subject would be a redundancy.

V. 1, p. 155, "J'ai su que vous étiez parti." *Vous étiez parti* is taken for the imperfect.

V. 1, pp. 170 to 175. In these pages Mr. Pargment gives a somewhat detailed description of the various uses of the adverbs.

<sup>2</sup> This objection would be invalid if the original composition work is intended as home work, to be corrected by the instructor and returned to the pupil. In his directions on page IX, Vol. I, as to the way to use his books, Mr. Pargment does not state clearly how he would plan to have this original work taken up. From his general directions, one would infer, however, that he has intended it for classroom work.

Lack of uniformity here is striking. The meanings of some of the very common adverbs are defined; others, less common, are left undefined and only the preposition by which they are followed is indicated. Thus, *aussi* and *si* are needlessly defined while *auparavant* is left to conjecture.

V. 1, p. 172. *Davantage* cannot be followed by *de* or *que*. This is a difficult and unimportant point and in dispute among grammarians.<sup>3</sup>

P. 177. *Depuis*, *pendant*, and *pour* are said to be conjunctions and are treated under that title; so also *vers* and *envers*.

The vocabularies at the end of each one of the volumes appear in an incomplete form. They are abridged, we are told in the preface, but why in the way they have been, one cannot understand. What motive has guided the author in giving such common words as: *argent*, *fit*, *jeu*, *mener*, while less common ones such as *au figuré*, *au propre*, *déranger*, *loir*, etc. are left out? The reviewer has counted no less than thirty-five words on page 75, vol. II, that are missing from the vocabulary of that volume. Here it is evident that the commonness of the words has not been the motive in deciding which shall be given and which left out. Taking at random fifteen words from that page—words that are equally easy or difficult for the average second year student of French: *surprenant*, *bavard*, *ennuyer*, *s'occuper*, *blessé*, *rayon*, *bonheur*, *éclair*, *coup de tonnerre*, *meuble*, *bride*, *s'éloigner*, *échapper*, *moulin*, *balancer*—only five of these are found in the vocabulary: *bonheur*, *s'ennuyer*, *bavard*, *bride*, *échapper*.

Some unusual and rather inaccurate translations appear not infrequently. Note the following: *colis*, parcel post, *chaussure*, shoes; *duvet*, wool; *à mesure que*, in proportion to; *veiller*, to take care of; *coller*, to paste; *s'engourdir*, to become dull (of a squirrel in winter); *boucher*, to shut; *crêver* [?] to put out; *rancune*, resentment; *recueillir*, to get; *épi*, ear [of what?]; *s'écrouler*, to fall down; *rabattre*, to turn down; *bégayer*, to lisp; *bousculer*, to hustle; *allaiter*, to suckle; *apprivoiser*, to make familiar.

Despite the regrettable errors in grammar to which attention has been called above, and despite the incomplete form in which the vocabulary appears, the two volumes viewed as a whole are highly interesting. They furnish in great abundance fine material for practice, both constructive and analytic. They appear, indeed, to have been written from a point of view that is quite in accord with the tendency of the "most recent aspirations of modern language teaching."

GEORGE GETCHEV

Syracuse University

<sup>3</sup> The *Dictionnaire général*, in speaking of *davantage que*, says "vieilli." Larive et Fleury say: "*Davantage que* est correct contrairement à l'avis des grammairiens."